

counties not only to participate, but to carry out their duties of taking care of noxious weeds.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Thank you, Senator Johnson. I understand we have an amendment on the desk to the committee amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Vickers...Senator, just for clarification purposes, the amendment you had printed last year you want to withdraw. Is that right?

SENATOR VICKERS: Correct. Yes.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Vickers would move to amend. You will find the amendment, it is Request 1660. You will find it in your bill book. 1660, you will find it in your bill book.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, the amendment that I offer to the committee amendments...well, first of all, let me clarify what the Clerk just mentioned to you. It is printed...it is the printed amendment, amendment number 1660 that should be in your bill book right in front of LB 459 and it does rewrite the entire bill. It will become the bill, so that you understand. The committee amendment, as explained by Senator Johnson, made a major philosophical change as opposed to the original content of the green copy of LB 459. LB 459, as introduced, would say very simply that the Department of Agriculture would not have any authority over the counties as far as weed control is concerned. In other words, we would leave the control of noxious weeds totally up to the discretion of each individual county. Now, I felt and I think the majority of the members of the Agriculture Committee felt that that was not the proper procedure to follow. But we did understand that there was a problem and the problem being that we had not funded enough funds to the Department of Agriculture to actually go in and take over the control of noxious weeds, if, in fact, the county didn't do it. So the Department of Agriculture was put in a difficult situation. On the one hand, they were told to...under the current law, they were told if a county doesn't do it, then you go in and do it. Well, the state didn't have the funds or the resources to do it, so as a matter of practice they weren't doing anything. Well, I just feel very strongly that we had ought to have